

STATE OF CONNECTICUT

COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

Keith Ainsworth Acting Chair August XX, 2023

Alicea Charamut

Kevin F. Carifa, Transportation Planning Director Connecticut Department of Transportation Bureau of Policy and Planning 2800 Berlin Turnpike Newington, CT, 06131

Christopher Donnelly

Re: State Project No. 102-358, Route 7 / Route 15 Interchange

David Kalafa

Dear Mr. Carifa,

Kip Kolesinskas

Matthew Reiser

The Council on Environmental Quality (Council) offers the following comments regarding the Environmental Impact Evaluation (EIE) for the Route 7 / Route 15 Interchange project in

The Department of Transportation's (DOT) EIE notes that alternative 21D could permanently impact approximately 3 acres of wetlands, approximately 120 linear feet (LF) of intermittent

Denise Rodosevich

Norwalk.

Charles Vidich

William Warzecha

streams, and approximately 650 LF of perennial streams, while the preferred alternative 26 could permanently impact approximately 1.4 acres of wetlands, approximately 40 LF of intermittent streams, and approximately 410 LF of perennial streams. As noted in the Council's annual report, *Environmental Quality in Connecticut*, "wetlands serve many functions, one of them being their unique ability to store and sequester carbon", and wetlands "should be recognized as important to greenhouse gas (GHG) mitigation strategies and incorporated into inland wetland protection efforts in Connecticut." The Council notes that the potential permanent impacts to wetlands in the proposed project area could impact the values and functions of remaining nearby wetlands, identified within the proposed project area. The Council questions whether the EIE should also include a review and analysis of the potential impacts to 1) carbon sequestration and storage for

the potential permanent impacts, and 2) wetland values and functions for the remaining nearby wetlands resulting from the potential permanent impacts to wetlands within the proposed project

Paul Aresta Executive Director

The EIE notes that "impacts to wetlands would be mitigated per state and federal requirements" and that "any mitigation needs following those avoidance measures would be identified and agreed upon in conjunction with the appropriate regulatory agencies". The Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies, Section 22a-1a-8 (f)(6)(E) states that a discussion of the potential environmental impact of the action should include "mitigation measures to the action including: limiting the degree or magnitude of the action; rectifying the effects of such action by repairing, rehabilitating or restoring the impacted environment; reducing or eliminating the impact over time by preservation and maintenance operations; and compensating for the impact by replacing or providing substitute resources or environments." Consequently, the Council questions if the DOT considered establishing one or more compensatory wetland areas within the project area to compensate for the possible permanent impacts to wetlands. If not, should the potential permanent impacts to wetlands within the project area be included in the review and analysis of "Irreversible and Irretrievable Commitments of Resources"?

The Council received a complaint from a resident of Westport in May 2022 regarding the noise generated by traffic travelling along Route 15 over bridge expansion joints in the Westport area. The EIE notes that because the noise level would exceed the noise abatement criteria (NAC) within the project area, evaluation of abatement strategies is required. In sections 3.4.3 and 7 it states that "CTDOT's final recommendation regarding noise abatement would be made during the project's final design and public involvement process". However, in Tables 2.4.2 and E1.1.1, for both alternative 21D and the preferred alternative 26, the EIE states that "although the NAC is approached/exceeded in 1 location, initial analysis shows noise abatement is not considered reasonable." Consequently, the Council questions how noise generated by traffic within the project area, including noise potentially generated by vehicles travelling over the expansion joints for the four new bridges and two existing historic bridges for the preferred alternative 26², would be mitigated in the final design for nearby receptors.

The EIE states in sections 3.8.3 and 7 that "the Project design would be in accordance with the General Permit for the Discharge of Stormwater from CTDOT Separate Stormwater Discharge Systems (TS4) to the maximum extent practicable to mitigate any potential increases to current impairments (sedimentation/siltation) identified on the 303(d) list for the segment of the Norwalk River that traverses the Project area (ID CT7300-00_01)". The EIE also states that the CT DOT will "identify specific stormwater management and monitoring practices during Project design, including practices to mitigate sedimentation or siltation to the Norwalk River". The Council questions under what circumstances the CTDOT would not be able to meet the requirements of the General Permit for the Discharge of Stormwater, what potential impacts could result from failing to meet the General Permit requirements, and how could the project design eliminate and not just mitigate sedimentation or siltation of the Norwalk River potentially resulting from the proposed project.

Thank you for your consideration of the Council's comments.

Sincerely,

Paul Aresta Executive Director

_

¹ Connecticut Council on Environmental Quality, Environmental Quality in Connecticut, May 4, 2023; https://portal.ct.gov/CEQ/AR-22-Gold/2022-CEQ-Annual-Report-eBook/Land---Preserved-Land/Wetlands

² The same question would apply for alternative 21D that would require the construction of eleven new bridges and the reconstruction of three existing bridges.